

Abi-Nassif Reference. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reading of the Abi-Nassif Reference as applied to the claimed invention.

The Examiner points to FIG. 5 of the Abi-Nassif Reference which shows a flow chart for implementing a method of the Reference. Specifically, at step 504, a first back-off window is calculated and at step 506 a second back-off window is calculated. The remaining steps use the first and second back-off windows for further calculations for **internal** collision resolution. The Reference makes **no** mention of **sending** the windows to a user over a network because there is no need to do so: the windows are used for internal collision resolution. In fact, the Reference mentions in the Background section that problems exist when secondary stations attempt to perform ranging functions which involve exchanging messages over a network. Thus, the Reference teaches away from sending windows to a secondary station by having a primary station calculate back-off windows and use the windows to perform collision resolution centrally at the primary station.

In sharp contrast, claim 1 of the present invention recites a method that includes **sending** a first back-off window to plurality of users, calculating a second back-off window and **sending** the second back-off window to a plurality of users over a network. In other words, the method **sends** the back-off windows to a **plurality of users** over a network. For example, in one embodiment, Fig. 1 shows a wireless internet access system 10 that includes an access point 12 in communication with a plurality of devices 14. A communication link 16 couples the devices 16 to the access point 12. A collision resolution device 30 determines whether a collision has occurred and is responsible for calculating back-off windows. The resolution device 30 sends the back-off windows to

the access point 12 and the access point 12 sends the back-off window to the remote devices 14 over the link 16. In contrast, although the Abi-Nassif Reference calculates back-off windows, it simply does **not** send the windows to users over a link as in the present invention.

Consequently, the Abi-Nassif Reference fails to teach or suggest independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-3 and 5-7 and thus does not anticipate the claimed invention for at least the above reasons. Independent claims 10 and 17 recite similar subject matter as claim 1 and thus the Reference does not anticipate claims 10, 13, 14 and 17 for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has objected to claims 4, 8, 9, 12, 15, 16 and 19 for being dependent on an allowable base claims but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

For the above stated reason, Applicant believes that these claims are already in condition for allowance.

#### **Request for Reconsideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111**

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the Office Action mailed on December 16, 2004, Applicant requests reconsideration in the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and requests that the Examiner allow claims 1-19 and pass the application to issue. Please charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 50-1561, and reference Attorney Docket No. 29633.042700. If there is any point

requiring further attention prior to allowance, the Examiner is asked to contact Applicants' counsel who can be reached at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully,

By Claude R. Narcisse

Claude R. Narcisse

Reg. No. 38979

(212) 801-3190

Date: March 14, 2005